



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,489	08/15/2006	Yoshinori Tajima	08228/087001	5140
22511 7590 08/29/2008 OSHA LIANG I.L.P. 1221 MCKINNEY STREET SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010				
EXAMINER CLEMENTE, ROBERT ARTHUR				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1797				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/29/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
buta@oshaliang.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/566,489

Applicant(s)

TAJIMA ET AL.

Examiner

ROBERT A. CLEMENTE

Art Unit

1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 January 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/ISD)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20060130

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. The term "an equivalent product" in claims 5 and 9 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "an equivalent product" is not defined by the claims, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Neither the claims nor specification provide a definite means for determining what constitutes an equivalent product to molecular sieve 13X.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, and 3 - 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,425,946 to Funke et al.

Funke discloses a method for super-activating carbon particles to form ultra-low emission (ULE) carbon material, as disclosed in the abstract. This material is then used in various units for separating gases. The different gas separating units are shown in figures 2 - 5. In regard to claim 1, figure 3 shows a gas separating unit with two columns (64, 164) packed with different fillers (14, 82). The second column (64) is packed with the ULE carbon material (14) and the first column (164) is packed with secondary scavenger beads (82). In regard to claim 6, figure 4 shows a gas separating unit with a single column (264) packed with the ULE carbon material (14) and with secondary scavenger beads (82). Funke does not distinctly disclose using the separating units for gas chromatography; however, the examiner regards this limitation as intended usage. The separating units of figures 3 and 4 include all of the structural limitations of claims 1 and 7, respectively. Additionally, the columns of Funke contain ULE carbon material, which is an activated carbon material, and secondary scavenger beads, which can be various molecular sieves, as disclosed in column 11 lines 32 - 36. Activated carbon and molecular sieves are well known gas chromatography stationary phases, thus the separating units of Funke inherently are capable of performing a chromatographic separation.

In regard to claims 3, 4, 7 and 8, the specific gases used are regarded as intended usage. The type of gas used does not affect the structure of the unit. As discussed above the fillers of Funke comprise zeolite and activated carbon.

In regard to claims 5 and 9, as disclosed in column 11 lines 32 - 36, the secondary scavenger material can comprise molecular sieves containing silica and mixed oxides. Molecular sieve 13X is a molecular sieve that generally contains silica, and aluminum, sodium, and magnesium oxides. Thus, molecular sieve 13X contains silica and mixed oxides. Therefore, the molecular sieves of Funke can be considered to be equivalent products, as broadly recited in the claim, to molecular sieve 13X because they generally comprise the same types of materials.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Other prior art references listed on the PTO-892 (Notice of References Cited) are considered to be of interest disclosing similar gas separating units.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT A. CLEMENTE whose telephone number is (571)272-1476. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RAC

/Duane S. Smith/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797
8-27-08